we cannot withdraw from this relentless fight against terrorism and the best assurance for that is the continuation of President's rule until the situation returns to a point where we can restore popular Government. It is wrong and it is pathetic to believe that there is an upsurge for popular Government headed by any one from the Shiromani Akali Dal party. In fact, what is popular about them? There is nothing which is popular about them. In fact, it is doubtful if they command a majority in the State Legislature if we exclude the disqualified Members. The only way that Government survived between December, 1985 and May, 1987 was because of the Congress party which supported that Government, and once we withdrew our support, once we took a political decision that we will be failing the people of this country if we support a Government which was collapsing, disintegrating, dissolving because of its own inconsistencies, the decision to impose President's Rule was inevitable. Sir, I must humbly seek the support of this House to this Bill to confer legislative powers upon the President during President's Rule.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): Now the question is:

"That the Bill to confer on the President the power of the Legislature of the State of Punjab to make laws, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): We shall now take up clause-by-clause consideration of the Bill.

Clauses 2 and 3 were added to the Bill.

Clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Title were added to the Bill.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: Sir, I move:

"That the Bill be passed."

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): The question is:

"That the Bill be passed."

The motion was adopted.

SHORT DURATION DISCUSSIONS RE: INDO-SRI LANKAN AGREEMENT

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): The House will take up Short Duration Discussion on the statement made by the Prime Minister in the House on the 31st July, 1987, regarding the Indo-Sri Lanka Agreement to establish peace and normalcy in Sri Lanka.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY (Tamil Nadu): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am very happy that our hon. Prime Minister returned safely unhurt, when the Sri Lankan sailor attacked him during the guard of honour. But, Sir, what was the immediate reaction of the head of the Sri Lankan Government, Mr. Jayewardene that appeared in the press? He said, due to sun stroke, the sailor fainted and fell on the Prime Minister. That was the reaction. That shows the inner mind of Mr. Jayewardene. Our Hon'ble Prime Minister described this Accord as unprecedented in the 20th century. Yes, I concur with him. It is an unprecedented Accord because this is an Accord between the mediator and the aggressor. It is not an Accord between the aggressor and the aggressed. It is not an Accord between the oppressor and the oppressed. It is not an Accord between the mediator and the aggressor. I am shocked to know that the militants were not taken into confidence and they did not give their consent to the Accord. So,

[Shri V. Gopalsamy]

they were not a party to the Accord. LTTE, the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam, they are a force to reckon with in Sri Lanka and their leader, Mr. Prabhakaran was brought here and he was kept in Ashoka Hotel at the time the Sri Lankan Radio broadcast that he was kept under protective custody of Indian Government. I myself went there on 29th July to the Ashoka Hotel. He was staying in Room No. 518 in the 5th floor. The black cat commondos were there. I was not permitted even after I established my identity as a Member of Parliament. So, he was kept incommunicado. For what reasons, they did not give the consent? According to my information, he was brought here tricked and trapped. That is why he gave a statement immediately when he was told about the package proposals that they have walked into a trap and they have been stabbed behind our back. I would like to know from the hon. Minister for what reasons the militants were not taken into confidence because they have not given their consent. Even on 4th August, Mr. Prabakaran made it categorically clear that "it has been imposed on us. We were not taken into confidence. We have not given our consent. This package of proposals will not bring peace and freedom for our people." Sir, the most untrustworthy, unreliable, undependable politician of whole South-East Asia, according to my opinion, is Mr. Jayewardene, the President of Sri Lanka. It is he who led the agitation against the Pact of 1957. The man who has been the supreme advocate for Sinhalese chauvinism, the man who has been a force all along to nurture racial hatred in the minds of the Sinhalese people all these years, for three decades, the man who ruthlessly waged a war against his own population, the Tamils, the man who vowed to finish all the Tamils, the Tamil militants, all of a sudden, has become the Messiah of Peace. It took many years to get wisdom even for Gauthama Buddha. But the head of a monstrous regime, one fine morning, suddenly gets wisdom and declares dialogue and accord. For what reason? He declared that military solution is the only possible way to deal with the problem. He launched his three forces, the Army, Navy and Air Force, to crush the militants. Even though he launched all the three forces, he failed. Then he wanted to disarm the militants. Therefore, he opted for this Accord.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the most disturbing and shocking aspect of the Accord is sub-clause (3) of clause (2) regarding referendum. In Thimpu, when the Tamils, including the militants, presented their proposals, out of the four cardinal subjects they put forth, only one thing you have conceded, that is ,regarding their traditional homeland that is, the Eastern Province should be linked with the Northern Province and should be treated as one administrative unit. Clause 2.3 of the Accord says that there will be a referendum on or before 31st December, 1988 to enable the people of the eastern province to decide whether the eastern province should remain linked with the northern province as one administrative unit. On the very next day, when Pressmen sought a clarification from Mr. Jayewardene, he clearly stated that there was no question of linking up and these two provinces only will be working together. Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the clause referring to a referendum in the Accord is a fraud against Tamils; a deliberate fraud against the interests of Tamils committed by Sri Lanka to which India has become a party, because, Mr. Jayewardene himself says,—I quote from "The Hindu" dated 7th August and this is a report from the Reuter agency—"Mr. Jayewardene said the peace accord envisaged a temporary linking, into a single administrative unit, of the Tamil-dominated North

with the Eastern province, where Tamils are out-numbered by Sinhalese and Muslims. But a referendum to be held in the East after one year would surely reject the continuation of the arrangement. "So what are we quarrelling about," he asked Sinhalese opponents of the accord. He said "no fear needed about the result of the referendum" and urged those who opposed the link-up of the two provinces to join him in campaigning in the East against it." He says he is going to campaign against this merger to get suport for the referendum. He has spelt out his inner mind. He is not for the merger. Sir, the demography of the Eastern province has been totally changed due to State-aided colonisation over thirty years. In 1957, the population of Sinhalese in the Eastern Province was only nine per cent. Today it is twenty-four per cent due to State-aided colonisation, due to forcible colonisation. And the population of Tamils has been reduced by 20 per cent. As the British played the divide-and-rule game in India, the same Policy is being practised by Mr. Jayewardene to divide the Hindus and the Muslims. That is why he says the Muslims will not vote for merger. Muslims, though they are Muslims, first they are Tamils. Both the Hindus and the Muslims have joined the militants. Yet he says the Muslims will not vote for merger. This is a divide-and-rule policy. Also, thousands and thousands of Sinhalese have been brought into the areas which Tamils have evacuated due to Sri Lankan terrorist attacks. So he himself clearly said that the referendum will go against merger. Tamils have been cheated. They have been betrayed through this clause regarding referendum. That is why I said it is a fraud against the Tamils. The agreement also says, "A simple majority will be sufficient to determine the result of the referendum." Had the Government of India been sincere to protect the interests of Tamils, they would have suggested one thing: At least let us make 1957 the cut-off year; that is, those who entered this area after 1957 will not be given the franchise, the right to vote. But they have not done it. Therefore, the referendum is definitely going to decide against merger. Mr. Jayawardene has put one other condition. The proposals are conditional to an acceptance of the proposals negotiated from 4th May, 1986 to 19th December, 1986 and residual matters not finalised during the above negotiations shall be resolved between India and Sri Lanka within a period of time. What are the proposals discussed between May and December, 1986? These proposals were not at all accepted by the Tamils, including the moderate Tamils, because during the December, 19th proposals you all suggested the inclusion of Amparai electorate in the inquiry. You wanted to divide the eastern province into three provinces. That was not accepted by the Tamils. This Amparai electorate has taken shape due to colonisation where Sinhalese have been brought. What about the devolution of powers? Even Annexure C which was formulated through Madam Gandhi's time was better than this proposal. What about the devolution of powers? What about job opportunities? What about opportunities in the educational institutions? It is very vital but it is very much vague here. The Tamils have been deprived of their basic rights all these years and that is why they have been fighting. It is very vague about the devolution of powers. Not only that. Here another most disturbing aspect of the Accord is sub-clause (6) to Clause 16, part (d) which says:

> "The Government of India will expedite repatriation from Sri Lanka of Indian citizens to India who are residing there concurrently with the repatriation of Sri Lankan refugees from Tamil Nadu."

[Shri V. Gopalsamy]

These Tamils were taken there in the early period of the 19th century as plantation labour by the British Estate Owners. Thousands and thousands of Tamils went there from the southern districts of Tamil Nadu. They shed their blood and sweat and tears and it is due to their sweat and toil that Sri Lanka attained prosperity. But in 1948 due to the most obnoxious legislation they were made Stateless and voteless. India committed an unpardonable blunder, an unpardonable betrayal, against the Tamils in 1964 in the name of the Shastri-Srimovo Pact. These Tamils have lived there; they have worked there, for more than 100 years or more than 150 years. What right have you got to bring them here? It is the duty of the Sri Lankan Government to confer citizenship on them. Leave alone that. In the year 1981, Madam Gandhi had emphatically stated, "No more repatriation. The agreement is over. It is the duty of the Sri Lankan Government to give citizenship to those Tamils, the plantation labour.". But now you are going to take them. Lakhs and lakhs have landed here under Shastri-Srimovo pact and life has become a hell for them. Now you say you are going to take two lakhs. For what purpose? What right have you got? They have been therefore more than a hundred years and it is the duty of the Government of Sri Lanka. You should have stressed this point in the talks with the Sri Lankan Government and you should have said: "Give citizenship to these people.". But you are equating the refugees who came here due to the genocidal attacks there with these people; you are equating them. Now, what is the reaction of the refugees? They ask: "We have lost our property; we have lost our mothers; we have lost our kith and kin; and we have lost our children. Now, should we go there as beggars?". This is the reaction of the people in the refugee camp. Now, with regard to this clause, for bringing those repatriates here, you have no right. Why are you bringing them here? Therefore, this aspect was not at all considered. You did not get the consent of the Tamils.

Sir, our honourable Prime Minister, since the accord was signed, from that minute onwards, wherever he goes talks about the accord. Now, this is his speech in Naini on 1st August:

> 'The accord provides that Sri Lanka would not allow the presence on its soil of armed forces of any country or allow warships of any kind to enter its waters."

Sir, he is misleading the country. You show me where the provisions are in the accord. Nothing is there. About the presence of intelligence agencies, there is nothing. Only in the exchange of letters it is mentioned. There also it is very hypothetical and it is very vague.

> "The two leaders will reach an early understanding about the need for the employment of foreign military intelligence personnel with a view to ensuring that such presence will not prejudice the Indo-Sri Lankan relations."

Why have you not put it in the agreement? Also, about Trincomalee :

> "Trincomalee or any other place in Sri Lanka will not be made available for military use to any country."

Why have you not put it in the agreement? ...*(Time bell rings)*... Kindly give me some more time, Sir.

Sir, our honourable Prime Minister said in Naini that no foreign army would be allowed on the soil of Sri Lanka or no foreign vessels would be allowed in the waters of Sri Lanka. But the very next day, Sir,

Mr. Jayewardene has made the request to the USA, UK, China and Pakistan for military assistance. He himself has stated this and it has come in the Press. Then why are you misleading the country? He has categorically said: "I have sought help, military assistance, from the USA, UK, Pakistan and China." I would like to know from our honourable Minister of State for External Affairs whether any member of the foreign intelligence agency has so far vacated, has gone away from Sri Lanka. No body has left. What about the Special Interest Section of Israel? They are still there and Mosad is still there.

Sir, our honourable Prime Minister, when he addressed the people on the Marina sands on 2nd August, said one thing. I am very sorry about his observations and this type of observation was circulated in the form of a literature by a Sinhalese racist some time last year to the Members of Parliament and it was that the Sinhalese originally went from Bengal and Orissa and the Tamils went from Tamil Nadu. He wanted to create a rift or a sort of clash between the Aryan race and the Dravidian race. That literature was circulated amongst the Members of Parliament. Our Prime Minister also goes there and makes this statement at Madras that the Sinhalese went from Orissa and Bengal and the Tamils went from Tamil Nadu.

Sir, I am very sorry. There
4.00 p.m are two classes of Tamils in Sri Lanka. I have just now referred to the plantation labour who went there from here in the 19th century. The other Tamils who are fighting there and who have been facing the massacre all these years in the Northern and Eastern Provinces of Sri Lanka are the original inhabitants from the dawn of history. Sir, Madam Gandhi, the then Prime Minister, while discussing the Sri Lanka affairs on the floor of this very House in the year 1984 August—I think it was her last speech made on the floor of the House—said in clear-cut terms that the Tamils are the original inhabitants of Sri Lanka. It is a statement of Madam Gandhi. But our Prime Minister went all the way to Tamil Nadu to exhibit his ignorance of history. It is not a small thing but it hurts us.

Everybody was expecting that the legislation will be tabled in the Parliament of Sri Lanka tomorrow, i.e. Tuesday for ratification. But Mr. Jayewardene has now announced that it may be in the latter part of September or October. He has also stated to the press and the people that once the militants are disarmed, the Indian Army has to go back. Sir, when our Indian Army visited the area, the Sri Lankan Tamils in the Northern and Eastern Provinces were very happy because all these years they have suffered the genocidal attack, violence and repression. Their destiny has been written in tears and blood. The million dollars question is that the moment you withdraw your troops, whether the same old story will be repeated or not. The 200 Army Camps have not so far been removed in the Northern and Eastern Provinces. He has announced that he is going to absorb in the para-military forces and Home Guards those hooligans and thugs who were recruited to annihilate the Tamils. All right. What about the Tamils? What is their representation in the security forces, in the Police and the Army? That is why I said about the devolution of power everything is vague in the Agreement.

Sir, even yesterday a Revered Father stated that at least for 25 years the Indian Army should be here. Sir, all the commitment that you have made to the Sri Lankan Government is for their benefit. The militants themselves have said this that the Agreement arrived at between the Indian and Sri Lankan Governments is for their own benefit and not for their benefit. What will happen after Tamil Militants surrendering the arms? The purpose was to disarm the militants. But why did they take up

the arms? It was to protect the dignity and honour of their mothers and sisters. They were compelled to take up arms to protect the dignity of their mothers and sisters and not simply for the purpose of taking up arms. You cannot equate any other situation with that of Sri Lanka. They are not terrorists. They are freedom fighters. What happens after they lay down their arms? What happens if President Jayewardene asks the Indian Army to withdraw? Where is the guarantee in the Agreement about the security of Tamils? There is no guarantee. I want a categorical answer from the Government as to what they are going to do in such a situation. What is the guarantee for the security of Tamilians?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): Please conclude.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: I am concluding, Sir.

Sir, if you ask me to give my opinion about the Accord, instead of making a speech, I could simply show this cartoon by Mr. Laxman which appeared last week in the Times of India'. Sir, here is Mr. Jayewardene. He is wonderfully portrayed. And he welcomes Mr. Rajiv Gandhi. He says, "It is bound to work, Rajiv with an expert like you." Here is our expert, our hon. Prime Minister, the master of accords, who has a penchant for accords, who surprised the country with Assam Accord and the Punjab Accord. But, Sir, the cartoon depicts him like this: He walks with a bandaged leg and a bandaged hand. On the bandaged hand, it is written 'Assam Accord' and on the bandaged leg, it is written 'Punjab Accord'. So, what is going to happen? This is going to be worse than the Punjab Accord in its implementation. Therefore, Sir, I will add only one point. In the name of Accord, you have betrayed the interests of the Tamils; just to divert the attention of the people in India, you have brought this Accord.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI (Maharashtra): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I heard with rapt attention my young friend, Mr. Gopalsamy, giving out his thrust on the Sri Lankan Accord and how it is going to be detrimental to this country. Mr. Gopalsamy, young as he is, mentioned about the cartoons. If politicians are to go by cartoons, then what he spoke was quite right because cartoons are for what you just call enjoyment of the political scene. It does not mean that it is Geeta for you. You are a politician..

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: I do not believe in Geeta.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: He is young, a little bit impulsive. I can accept that.

Sir, now I go to the main problem, how this Accord has been really beneficial and how the Parliament, the politicians, responsible persons in the country have to give this Accord the time to succeed. There are many reasons why this Accord had been gone into by the Government. Sir, I have read many Government notifications and Government statements. My young friend from Tamil Nadu and also other political party representatives are aware that this ethnic problem is going on for a very long time. Since 1983 violence has taken place and persons who have got nothing to do with the political aspect of this ethnic problem have been killed. Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I do feel that this problem has to be solved not only because the Tamils are concerned—my young friend and those who are opposing the Accord should take this into consideration—but also there is the security environment of our country which has to be taken into consideration. I do not want to speak in detail what the security perceptions are, particularly the security hazards which this

country is facing. At present, Sir, this country is in a very difficult position as regards the security aspect from its neighbours, from all sides of the continent. Everybody is aware of the nefarious intentions of the Pakistan Government, everybody is aware of the danger from China. Everybody is aware of various small States which are bordering this country and it has now come to a stage that the present political situation in this country and the security aspect should not be lost sight of by my friends in the opposition political parties because I do give great importance to the security perception of this country and it is not only to the credit of the Government, but it is also a courageous act on the part of the Prime Minister, who has signed this accord, who has forged this accord after long negotiations over the last one year. I feel that the Prime Minister deserves the credit for his courage shown.

Mr. Gopalsamy described the Prime Minister's hand and leg in a bandage, etc. etc. and that cartoon about the Punjab accord and the Assam accord. We have discussed the Punjab accord just now. Who has failed in Punjab? Is it the Congress Party who failed in Punjab? *(Interruptions)*. It is all the political parties which have failed in Punjab. It is not the Congress Party alone. It is the failure of the Janata Party, the Bharatiya Janata Party in fact all the political parties, including the Akali Party. In fact it is more the Akali party which has failed. I can say that when Mr. Darbara Singh spoke here...

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह (बिहार) : महोदय, व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री हेच० हनुमनतप्पा) : इसमें व्यवस्था क्या है ?

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : है, और यह है कि बहस चल रही है लंका के बारे में और यह उसे पंजाब के बारे में ले आए हैं, यह पंजाब पर बोल रहे हैं ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री हेच० हनुमनतप्पा) : राम अवधेश जी, आप भूल गए जब पंजाब पर डिसकशन हो रहा था, आप सीलोन पर ले आए थे । आप भी भूल गए थे, जो पंजाब के डिसकशन में सीलोन को ले आए थे ।

SHRI A. G. KULKARANI: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir when Punjab problem was discussed here and a reference about the particular provision in the Constitution was made, I was sitting there in the Opposition. Even then, Sir, I supported the Congress Party and desired that a security belt around Punjab should be provided, because the Punjab problem cannot be solved by the Akali party and that is what it has come to. I do hope that even the Communist parties which are there are going to the people and I do feel that other political parties will do the same thing, go to the people and convince the people that these terrorists are a danger to the country and to the integrity of the country.

But, Sir, the Punjab accord is not my subject. Even in Assam and everywhere the Prime Minister, who has done the greatest courageous act in Sri Lanka, should really be congratulated by the political parties, who should appreciate the courage shown by the Prime Minister. Sir, I need not mention but unfortunately he has had to face the butt of a gun and God was great and he was saved. I do feel, Sir, instead of casting jokes on these matters, a little bit of seriousness should be brought in this discussion.

Sir, I was on the point of security perception. I cannot explain or speak more on what is called the security perspective because it is the Government which has really to express its view. But I do feel that looking to the security perspective what I find now is that India is being isolated and it is in the interest of this country and the Tamilians who are in Sri Lanka that the steps taken by the

[Shri A. G. Kulkarni]

Government are supported by all political parties.

Sir, the other points which my friend has made politically regarding the referendum and small matters, etc. one has to take a larger view, I should say. We have to take a larger view. If we really want to defuse the conflict in Sri Lanka, it is necessary to have a larger view as well as a magnanimous heart and we must ignore these small problems. Many attempts are being made by certain political parties and personalities to confuse this issue. There might have been small matters which should have been sorted out better or there might be some other aspects of the accord; but by and large if we take a larger view of it, I feel that this accord is not only in the interest of this country but it is in the interest of those Tamil organisations which were fighting so heroically there.

Again, some defects have been pointed out that LTTE have not surrendered arms. But it is a slow process. When two warring entities are brought together, it takes a little time and I don't think delay of one day here or delay of a week there is going to break this accord...

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : भारत को क्या लाभ हो रहा है ?

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री ऐच० हनुमनतप्पा) : अवधेश जी, आप बोलने वाले हैं । बैठिए ।

श्री अरविन्द गणेश कुलकर्णी : भारत को क्या लाभ हो रहा है ? अरे भाई भारत को ही पूरा लाभ हो रहा है ।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): Don't answer. You continue.

SHRI A. G KULKARNI: I am not answering him. After all, he is a young friend of mine and I know his entire approach to many problems. Out country as well as other elements in Sri Lanka, the Tamils, are going to be benefited. India is going to be benefited. And if India is going to be benefited in its security perceptions, how can he say that India is not going to be benefited? I do feel that these guarantees were needed to show to the Sri Lanka Government and to Tamils there that they are in safe hands and that they should agree to what the Government has decided in their own interest, for which much effort was made. The Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu had put in his efforts, and it was due to the joint efforts of all concerned that this problem could be solved.

I have also got some doubts. I want to know whether in these perceptions, the Sri Lankan Government has agreed that other forces, like the Israeli force, the U.S. force, etc. are to be slowly disbanded and it will be an issue only between the Indian Goverrnment and the Sri Lankan Government which has been solved by this agreement in order to help the Tamils and to put an end to the violence, so that this agreement can work peacefully.

I do think the perception of the Government is not worng. The Government has really done an excellent job to defuse the situation in the interest of security, and I am sure this accord will produce the desired results, and for this, credit goes to the courageous act of our Prime Minister.

SHRI K. MOHANAN (Kerala): Mr. Vice-Chairman, at the outset I would like to make it clear that I and my party are generally in support of the accord signed by the two Heads of States of India and Sri Lanka on 29th of last month. It was our consistent stand for all these years that a political solution could be found out to end the ethnic problem of Sri Lanka. I am fully aware that there are many doubts, fears, apprehensions on both sides, the Sinhala majority and the Tamil minority in regard to the pro-

visions of the accord. Not only that, I am also aware that the signing of the accord by itself will not solve the ethnic problem. In spite of all these its and buts, I am in favour of the accord because it is a step in the right direction to end the ethnic probem in Sri Lanka and restore peace, amity and progress in the island nation. Sir, the most important part of this accord, according to me, is that it provides for the preservation of the unity, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Sri Lanka. It also recognises the island's status as a multi-ethnic and multi-lingua one. The three main languages, namely, Sinhala, Tamil and English have been recognised as the official languages of the country. The accord also recognises that the Sri Lankan Tamil people, the minority ethnic group, will have the right to live with others with an equal status. According to me, this is the essence of this accord and all other details are of only secondary importance. If these principles are adhered to by the Sri Lankan Government, the Sinhala majority as well as the Tamil minority, it will be an achievement not only for Sri Lanka but also to the entire region.

Sir, I am fully aware that there are many hurdles in the way of the implementation of the accord. An influential section of public opinion in Sri Lanka is still opposing it. Every day, we get dsturbing as well as encouraging news from Sri Lanka My esteemed colleague, Sri Gopalsamy, pointed out here the news emanating from Sri Lanka in regard to the sending back of the Indian peace keeping force. There were also Press reports that Mr Jayewardene is trying to seek the support of the U.S.A., the U K and some other countries. This is all disturbing news. In spite of all these things, we have to take into account the situation prevailing in the Sub-continent and we will have to view the situation from the angle of our national security also.

Sir, I wecome the decision of the LTTE, which is the main Tamil militant group in Sri Lanka, to accept this accord, even though with reservations. I know, even in this latest statement, Mr Prabakaran has expressed some reservations. It s quite natural. At the same time, welcome their decision to accept the accord and to lay down arrms. Of course this laying down of arms also is a difficult process. I do agree. But I expect that this process will go through smoothly, on the basis of mutual understanding and negotiations. Sir, it is a very complicated issue. Within a fortnight or a month we can not solve this. We will have to move step by step in the right direction. That is why I am asking my friends to be a little patient. Let us wait and see and if this accord is implemented in its letter and spirit, it will be helpful to Sri Lankan Tamil minority as well as our country.

I do not want to go into details of this accord at this stage. It is a fact that still some doubts and fears are prevailing in the minds of the Tamil ethnic minority in Sri Lanka. Now our responsibility has increased. Now we are not a mere mediator now we are a party to the agreement. So our responsibility has increased. It is the duty of the Sri Lankan Government as well as the Government of India to remove these doubts from the minds of the Tamil minority and to give full protection to them at any cost.

It appears from press report that there has been a significant change in the attitude of some important political persons like Prime Minister Premamadasa and Internal Security Minister, Mr. Athulathmudali, from their original stand. If the press reports are correct, this is something encouraging. We have to utilise all these important persons to implement this accord in its letter and spirit. Even though the fundamentalist and vested interests among the Sinhala majority are opposing the accord, there is another encouraging factor—that the left and democratic forces among the Sinhala majority as well as Tamil minority are supporting this accord and they are

[Shri K. Mohanan]

for the impementation of this accord. This is also an encouraging factor. Continued confrontation will yield nothing The latest reports show that more than 14 thousand people were killed and the whole economy of the island has been shattered. For us also, as I have already mentioned, it has been a matter of concern from the viewpoint of our national security. We should realise that the only gainers of this continued confrontation are the US imperialsts and their agents, those who are working in this region. The region is already a zone of tension. Not only that, in the background of the Gulf War, tension is mounting in the Indian Ocean. The latest reports indicate that the United States is deploying more and more naval power in the Indian Ocean. This is also a cause for concern. So we do not want to make this region a zone of tension; we have to make a zone of peace. This is more important than anything else. So, if this accord and its implementation help us go a step forward, it will be to the benefit of the people of Sri Lanka as well as the people of India and generally the Indian subcontinent.

With these words, I concude, Sir.

SHRI S. C. JAMIR (Nagaland): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, as Member of the Council of Elders, I would like to offer some of my observations in a very very dispassionate manner. Our views our observations have to cut across party line because it concerns the whole nation.

The Indo-Sri Lankan Agreement of 29th July, 1987, marks a new chapter a new leaf in the relationship between these two neighbouring countries. And more so, it has put an end to the ethnic conflict which was threatening not only the very survival of the ethnic minority Tamils of Sri Lanka but it also theatened the Non-Alignment Movement which we have vey assiduously built up over the years. It was in a situation of stalemate that the Governmen of India had to step in at the invitation of the Government of Sri Lanka. This Accord is classic in the sense that India, though not a contending party—not a party to the conflict—had to enter into an agreement with a party in the conflict. It is not in any way a gunboat diplomacy. But the very fact that India had to sign this Accord as a third party, clearly proves that we enjoy moral authority over the situation. Had Sri Lanka no faith in us, if not the militants had faith in us we could not have entered into this agreement with Sri Lanka. So, I should say that from the very beginning India stood for one principle—that the unity and integrity of Sri Lanka shall have to be maintained but, at the same time, their ethnic problem has to be solved through a political framework. .... (Interruptions)..

Sir, it is only the wearer who knows where the shoe pinches. I am also from an area whose people had undergone that kind of a situation which the minority Tamils in Sri Lanka had undergone. When the very survival of a minority group is threatened, when they feel that their identity would be submerged one way or the other, when they are pushed to the wall, then and then only people take up arms. In Sri Lanka, over the years against this ethnic minority of Tamils, in spite of their definite territory, in spite of their population, in spite of their idenity and culure, systematic calculated, steps were taken to suppress them through various methods. I think the Sri Lankan Tamils also are peace-loving people, but they are human beings who want to survive as a people. They were compelled to take up arms. Why? Because they wanted to defend themselves, because they wanted to defend their own homeland. They very words 'Tamil Eelam" and "Separate Home land" had inspired a generation of Tamils there to live through blood and sacrifices. This problem would have been solved long ago had the Sinhalese Govt. recognised the very identity of the Tamil in Sri Lanka. But it is only when they replied

through arms, through violence—and then only —good sense prevailed in the mind of the President of Sri Lanka.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, when we, as a nation, we, as a country deeply feel the very ethnic identity of the Sri Lankan people I think we have to apply the same yardstick in this country also. When a minority group, whether it is tribal or any other minority, wants to survive by having autonomy, don't brand them as anti-national. They want to survive, they want to live, they want to exist as citizens. When its pride is hurt, then, however small a community it might be, it will rise. It will not be afraid of laying down lives for its cause. Therefore, the Sri Lanka agreement has taught us a good lesson that solutions should not be by sheer armies but through recognition of their identity, whether it is ethnic or communal or tribal, which should be the guiding principle in the solution of many of the problems even in this country. If we do so in the case of our problems, I think, we shall be in a better position to appreciate our problems and solve them in a manner that our people will want.

The accord is a victory of the old tradition of tolerance and spiritual values of the two countries. The Prime Minister, Shri Rajiv Gandhi who symbolises the ethical and moral spirit of India, persuaded the Sri Lankan President. Shri Jayewardene who is a representative of the Buddhist wisdom, and he has responded positively. This accord was acclaimed by diverse forces, including countries not friendly to India. It is an evidence of its significance for peace not only in this region but for peace in the whole world.

This is also a unique accord in many ways. On formal request we have to deploy Indian armed forces in Sri Lanka. For what? I think here my dear colleague who preceded me also said that we have to deploy our forces to establish peace among their own people and also to help surrender of arms by the Tamil militants and to guarantee security.

I want to make some observation here, Sir. In an insurgency, in a revolution of this type, those people who were fighting for a cause, had their own status, they had their own ranks, they had their own authority, they had their own writ over a certain area. Once you disarm them, when you strip them of the arms, then, psychologically they will definitely feel that they are like fish out of water. And that feeling if you allow to linger on, then, frustration would creep in. The feeling of defencelessness, helplessness, if you allow to continue, I think, then, you will not be able to enthuse in them the confidence which is intended in this accord.

It is my request, therefore, that, in order to create confidence in the minds of the Tamils and for the security of their life and property, I think, arrangement should be made in such a way that those militants who have been fighting for their homeland should be recruited either in police or para-military forces. I am sure that they will not have confidence in the local police because bitterness has been built up over the years. Unless that confidence is created, the police force of Sri Lanka will not be of any use in maintaining law and order in the region. I would, therefore, request the Government of India to prevail upon the Sri Lanka Government to ensure that those militants who have fought, should not be allowed to get frustrated because once they are frustrated, they can again revert back to the old habit of fighting, and that will be a very dangerous problem once again.

Sir, India should use her good offices to ensure that the Tamils get proper facilities in matters of appointment, recruitment and admission in the universities. I was told that there had been a lot of discrimination

[Shri S. C. Jamir]

against the Tamils in matters of appointment and even in admission in the universities. If the Sri Lanka Government could give treatment, equal treatment to all, that alone can win the confidence of the Tamils, which has been shaken, I think, as a result of the conflict over the years. Here some argue that the Accord was in opposition. If that is so, I think, he or she is either too naive or does not understand the spirit of independence which permeates a free sovereign nation. Sri Lanka though a small island it is a proud nation, its strength of character is manifested in the Accord where they have readily agreed to accommodate the aspirations of the Tamils of Sri Lanka in a political framework but also ensuring the unit and integrity of that country. Formation of a Council where there will be a Chief Minister and a Governor, I think, they should be equipped with full powers to look after the internal affairs of that region. If we look into the history of the Island, Sir, we find that the ethnic conflict has resulted in untold sufferings and hardship to the innocent civilians. I wish General Aurora was here. In a conflict like this while trying to catch one insurgent, we harass 99 people. To catch one, you have to harass 99 and these 99 become your enemies and this exercise has continued for the last four years and I can quite understand the psychology, the feelings, the sentiments and the emotions of those Tamils who are in that Jaffna area specially. Therefore, it not only enjoins upon the Sri Lanka Government but on us also to use our good offices to instil confidence in the minds of the Sri Lanka people.

Sir, this Accord will be a golden chapter in the achievements of Shri Rajiv Gandhi, the Prime Minister of India. He has achieved a feat which eluded our leaders in India as well as in Sri Lanka for years. But I want to give a caution on this. Any agreement or accord is always a compromise. So naturally we have to give concessions from both sides. So we cannot satisfy fully cent per cent any party because it is a mutual agreement and, therefore, there shall definitely be concessions from both sides. The only redeeming feature is that both sides have agreed to abide by the agreement. But we have yet to see whether the signatories to the agreement will implement this Accord both in letter and spirit. (*Time bell rings*) I will conclude shortly.

Sir, immediately after signing of the Accord, there have been riots in Sri Lanka. Not only that the recklessness and madness of a sailor who attacked the honoured guest at most solemn occasion, deepens India's suspicion. But today we are happy to see through press reports that some political leaders in Sri Lanka have begun to realise the reality of the Accord because it benefits them and benefits us also. This Accord will benefit us because if the situation worsens in Sri Lanka, its repurcussions will be intensely felt in this country. If there is peace, it will be felt immediately in the Deccan Plateau. Our friends in Tamil Nadu will definitely feel that very strongly. But as a result of signing of this Accord, we have been able to remove a suspicion and the danger of embroiling in the whole country and Sri Lanka.

Sir, I want to caution one thing. All of us prefer peace to war, justice to oppression, harmony to discord, order to chaos and I think our attempt in this Accord is to fulfil this objective. All plans though launched with great hopes have to some degree disappointed planners for they have floundered on the rock of human selfishness. Let us ensure that we don't flounder on the human selfishness as far as this Accord is concerned. Blessed are the peace makers for they will be called sons of God. They will earn love and goodwill of their people. Likewise, our Prime Minister and Jayewardene

have earned the goodwill of everybody not only in India but in the whole world. With these few words, I once again thank you.

SHRI VALAMPURI JOHN (Tamil Nadu): Mr. Vice-Chairman, as a party, we welcome this Accord. It is true that this Accord is a historic Accord and it is a classic agreement and I would certainly say, it is a great historic Accord anoited in the milk of human kindness. At an hour of peril when hundreds and thousands of Tamils were massacred, it is a bold initiative from the Prime Minister of India in consultation with my leader D. M. G. R. Some solution has been found out. A child is born and I do not want to be a prophet of doom. Mr. Gopalsamy while initiating the discussion, was airing certain reservations, certain doubts and it is within his right to express his own misgivings on this kind of an Accord and all his fears are not unfounded. There is some kind of a foundation for any fear that comes out of a battler like him. But what I find is that as I was hearing Mr. Jamir, as he was concluding, he was peeling out from the Holy Bible a few statements from the Sermon on the Mount. It is all very pleasing to ears but as I was hearing him his pleasing statements, flowery turns of phrases of Jesus Christ, I was only reminded that after the Accord, as a nation, we are more in a celebrating mood than in a deliberating attitude. Pacts may come. There may be historic occasions. They may remain as great institutional changes in the passage of history. When the Versailles Pact came, half of the globe went in approbation of the Versailles Pact but history tells us the same Versailles Pact was completely submerged in encomiums and phrases in flowery terms caused another war. But Sir, the history tells us very clearly, it amplifies in very clear terms that the Versailles Pact as an accord, as an initiative ever remains for a newer world. But one shall see the implications, the aftermath of this kind of a Versailles Pact because this divided the world into two warring principalities in its horizontal divisions, it might have caused another war. See, anything may happen in the aftermath of a pact or an Accord. But as an Accord, as an agreement, one should accept that it is a very bold initiative on the part of the Prime Minister that he wants peace, peace at any price. He has taken this initiative because as a messenger, as a harbinger of peace, he has taken this bold initiative for peace in the nearby area, in the Indian Ocean because this kind of peace initiative could have stopped this massacre for the time being. We welcome this Accord and the seal of approval has already been put by major sections in Sri Lanka itself. But what I find is many journalists have gone there, writers have gone, our friends have returned after seeing these people, after really experiencing their pulse, tell us that major sections of Tamils in the northern as well as eastern provinces are happy. But they are not jubilant. Still the element of insecurity is there in their minds. When the Indian Army was marching in, they welcomed them, they distributed sweets. It all goes to prove that they have been spending sleepless nights and their nights were so long shadowy nights. There was infernal massacre. There was a total conflagration and when the dawn came, after fearful nights with night marish experiences they have a kind of relief that they have been led to some kind of respite, cool shower but this should be prolonged. This should be prolonging. This should remain for ever and they have been saying so repeatedly. How long the Indian army is going to be on Sri Lankan soil? Clause 15(c) of the Accord makes a provision for the presence of Indian army. Every day reports are coming. Some one says the Indian army is 10,000 in number. It is being stigmatised or branded as a peace-keeping force. It remains there and remains for keeping peace in the island only with the idea of saving the ethnic minority of Tamils.

[Shri Valampuri John]

It could remain there only under the supreme command of Mr. Jayewardene. At the same time, there is a conflicting report which says that it is not so and there are clues and clues from Delhi. But our army is there. There is a kind of tense situation that is prevailing for the last few days there. More army men may be forced to go to Sri Lanka. But the expectation of the militants and the freedom-fighters of the major sections of Tamils is that the army should be there at least for ten years. It is repeatedly said there by very Tamil that the Indian army should be on that soil at least for 10 years because they have the in-built, inherent fear in their mind because of the past harrowing experiences. Once the Indian army comes out of that soil, their life and property will be insecure. So, unless and until this kind of an element of insecurity is erased from the minds of Tamils there, there will be no solution. The Accord is welcome as a very bold peace initiative, as a positive step towards peace, permanent peace in the island. But the problelm is, they have been requesting everyone that it should prevail upon the people in Delhi that Indian army should be there for at least five years, ten years. This is the agreement. But are we going to be there? How long we can be there on a foreign soil? Can we be there against the will of the Sri Lankan President? Once the army is withdrawn, again the insecurity comes. Today, what I say may appear a mad man's prattle. But in reality, I tell you, I caution you, this is going to happen. Once the army is withdrawn, the next minute this will happen. The element of insecurity is already enveloping the population there. Already people are feeling that carnage is on. Again and again, they have been saying that only because there is a limping slowness in laying down arms nothing has happened. Why there is limping slowness in laying there is limping slowness in laying down arms? Only because colonisation of the Eastern Province is on unabated. Even after this Accord, there is colonisation. Yesterday, and day-before-yesterday it was there. In this week, there is colonisation. We are not people who could believe some kind of a report in a newspaper, unfounded report. I am not quoting any such. But there are journalists who have gone there, who could analyse things and understand them in a dispassionate manner. They say that colonisation is there. Unless the element of insecurity has been erased from the minds of Tamils in the Northern and Eastern Provinces, it is difficult. In such a situation, the limping slowness starts. It is a vicious circle. Unless and until you take a decision to prevail upon Mr. Jayewardene that this is an Accord only to be respected and cannot be wished away, the position will not improve. If it is wished away, that will be the greatest betrayal. For an agreement, there are two parties normally. It should be the fighting forces, the ethnic Tamils and the Sinhalese. But here, we are placed in a piquant situation wherein the mediator, the negotiator, has become a party and the Sri Lanka President is another. Two parties have come. But they are not the contenders. They are not warring principalities. A mediator, a negotiator has come into this kind of agreement. Now, what is our responsibility. Suppose we withdraw the army all of a sudden, at the dictates or the wishes of the Sri Lankan President, normalcy will be disturbed. Things will get worse and then, that will be the greatest betrayal in India's history. The reason is, all along, Mr. Jayewardene wanted the militants to be disarmed. But he could not succeed. What was not possible for Mr. Jayewardene was possible for Indian Government. Indian Government assured this and he had no other option and I will not

say anything more. They have surrendered. What was not possible for Mr. Jayewardene was possible for India. If it is possible for India, then your responsibility is all the more. Tomorrow the question of their security will be raised. The element of insecurity is there enveloping the whole of the population in the northern and eastern provinces. India will be held responsible for their security. And India is responsible because India has played a role in bringing these militants to a pact and India alone is responsible, because they are not the parties. India is a party and India should take the responsibility. Mr. Kulkarni is a wise man, a great man. He was making certain observations. He very correctly said that we should have a security perception. I have great respect for his age. In the course of his speech as he was concluding and as he was making a dispassionate analysis of the problem, he posed a question to the honourable Minister, Mr. Natwar Singh.

He says, we have a security perception in that area; we have to look at this problem from that angle. He reminded this House in a very senatorial way. He said—"Mr. Minister, Kindly assure us, kindly throw light on this, we would like to know whether all these troops, these foreign agencies, have all been withdrawn. Or are they in the process of withdrawing from the island?" This is what he wanted to know from the Government because that was agitating his mind. I would like to inform this House, still the Pakistani paratroopers and task forces are there, still the American commandos are there, still the Israeli commandoes are there; they are not withdrawing. Of course, they may say, an accord has been completed or an agreement has been concluded, but it is not possible for them to send out a foreign agency all of a sudden within twentyfour hours. We understand it, and we appreciate it that it is not possible to do so. But our conclusion is, our finding is, there is not even a step taken, not even a small, elementary, initiative taken, by the Sri Lankan Government. Then what will be the situation? Even yesterday and today in front of St Mary's Church in Batikola tens and thousands of Tamil mothers have been weeping their lungs out and wailing, gnashing their teeth, for their children. They are waiting for the return of their children. The process is already on. Even in the State-controlled newspapers they have said there are over 5000 arms with the tigers of LTTE and they are surrendering them. The surrendering process is on. Tamil youths have been held hostage. Those Tamil mothers have been weeping and wailing. I can understand your inability, your passivity, before this agreement, but after this agreement they are still weeping and wailing for their sons and daughters to return from the Boora camps, from the forests and from the death knots. What will happen to them? Our Prime Minister went there. It is not as if we are Painting a rosy picture. Still the situation is grim. If the Sri Lankan President rushes through his referendum in the north-east, it will be a great betrayal, there will be a great danger. He still speaks of a referendum; he speaks of December 31. Everything is watery, the ground is slippery. I would like to emphasise if he rushes through this kind of a referendum, it will be against the interests of the minorities, the ethnic Tamils. The whole world will ask: What happened in the eastern province? Colonisation of Sinhalese is on. It is unabated. It is unchecked even today. The second point is at least 50 per cent of the Tamils who had deserted their homes in the eastern province have not returned till today. So they are a minority there. They are not a minority traditionally, habitually. They are a minority purposely. They are reduced to a minority. They have been reduced to a minority by calculated machinations. That is, one province should not be a party. Eastern and northern provinces should not join together and it should not from an administrative unit. This is their aim and towards this aim they have been working even today. Therefore, the colonisation is still on. People

have not returned to their homes. Even in Trincomalee 40 villages have been destroyed. People are not returning to their homes because there is the element of insecurity. In this situation if there is a referendum, we know far certain Tamils will lose and the major, the cardinal, the principal, part of this area of agreement will completely go into thin air. That is why I say initiative has not come from them. You have shown your initiative :we appreciate it. You have taken a bold initiative we applaud it. You have our hope and approval. But Sri Lanka has not shown that kind of initiative. And past history has also proved umpteen number of times that Sri Lankan President never kept his word. And, Sir, it is shameful thing that he is the only man, I think, in the twentieth century who is often talking about Lord Buddha and Lord Buddha has become a caricature in Sri Lanka in the mouth of President Jayewardene because nothing is believable. So, I would like to know from the Government, from the honourable Minister, how long the army will be there because he has said, "Whenever we say, the army will return.". This is found in the Sri Lanka Government-controlled papers. The 16th August deadline was there. But now it remains. We are very happy. But how long are they going to be there, to remove the element of uncertainty that is there? Then, what about the referendum that is going to be held? He says, 'I will go and campaign against this referendum.'. In a referendum, anybody can go for campaigning. But it is something else when it is said by the President and when the President himself says, "I will go and campaign against this referendum.". It is something else then. In a democratic election, for campaigning anybody can go. I can go and say that I am for unification and somebody else can go and say that it should not be so, that the provinces will remain separate, and that is another matter. But for the President, who is to keep these things intact, who is to keep the unity of the country, to say, "I will go and campaign against it." means something else. He says it. So, we have very many doubts. It is an accord for peace and it is a harbinger of peace and I welcome this accord. We welcome this accord and we stand by it. You have taken the greatest initiative and this accord should be workedout. But we are only pinpointing that they are not sincere and you are here to decide and you are here to save the people because believing you only they have laid down their arms and your responsibility is all the more now and if you are not saving the people, that will be the greatest betrayal in India's history. Thank you.

5.00 P.M

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): Now, Mr. Chimanbhai Mehta.

SHRI CHIMANBHAI MEHTA (Gujarat): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, at the outset, allow me to say that I welcome this accord although the misgivings expressed by our friends should be kept in mind. But the major realities of South Asia and the security perceptions are the more dominant factors today and one should not ignore them. I do not want to elaborate on these perceptions. With a neighbouring country almost on the verge of aquiring an atom bomb and with other neighbouring countries also not so favourably disposed towards us, in such a situation, I know that that accord may not be so ideal, but, in the given situation, what was best has been derived by us from this accord.

I would not say that this has given us a lasting solution. Sir, this idea of a lasting solution is not realistic in international politics because treaties have been signed and they have been abrogated after some months or after some years and this we have seen. Just because we are searching for a lasting solution, for an ideal solution, can we go in for a continuous conflict? In a situation which is not so favourable to us, when we pose the issue like this, I think this accord was inevitable and this is the maximum that we could have derived from this position.

So, the question of minorty versus majority, whether it is in India, whether it is in Canada or whether it is in any

other country, is always a very thorny question and it is a thorny problem. The minority has a tendency to distrust the majority and when the minorities start fighting against discrimination or injustice, the majority also, at least a section of the majority, takes the stand that the minority is separatist. These two stands come into conflict and bloodshed takes place. I know that Srilankan Tamils or the Indian Tamils as we call them have been there since centuries. The question of homeland is also there in our country. Some minorities talk about their own homeland and we have not taken such ideas of homeland very favourably because ultimately the minority has to merge with the mainstream. Indians are there throughout the world. They are in Fiji. They are in other counrties also. In Sri Lanka, they are about 20 per cent. But are 51 per cent. We have to be very careful in such situations. All the Indians would look towards us. How long can the Government of India go on expanding conflicts? Or should we request our friends to merge with them?

As I understand from Mr. Gopalsamy's speech, the problem is this. That the Northern Province and the Eastern Province are to be merged on the basis of referendum. There will be one Governor, one Chief Minister, one Council of Ministers and like that. Now, in one province Srilankan Tamils have majority. In another Province which is to be merged, i.e. the Eastern Province, there are one-third Srilankan Tamils, one third Sinhalese and one third Tamil Muslims who are called Moors. You know the trouble in our country. I had been to Fiji two years back. I saw that one Indian was going to be the Prime Minister because they had the majority. But we always have a problem with religious minority. There also it was projected as a Hindu-Muslim question. Now these are our own creations exploited by imperialists. If in the referendum in Eastern Province, one-third Sinhalese and one-third Moors go against merger, then merger won't take place in December 1988. The referendum is going to take place under the supervision of Indian observers. Perhaps the fear is that the Eastern Province would not merger with the Northern Province. One-third separate area is the historical habitation These are the words used in the Agreement. The traditional homeland words have not been used. I want to ask one question. Suppose no merger takes place. I am all for merger. I am not interested in the merger not taking place. Suppose the merger does not take place and the referendum is not so successful as we would like it to be. In such a situation, would the Tamils be thrown out from Sri Lanka? Would they be deprived of jobs which they are having today? I know that the majority there is trying to discriminate. There are extremists there also. But can you overcome that problem through the help of the Government of India or gradually merging with the mainstream. Because Sri Lankan Tamils are more literate and as far as job opportunities are concerned they could do something better also. In the month of January I had been there. They said, "you are five crores in Tamil Nadu. Sri Lankans are just around 80 lakhs and 20 lakhs Tamils, are here. Are we not in a minority?" If you go on projecting this minority-majority problem all the time and not try to find a solution then there cannot be any peace. One day you have got to settle this sort of problem. Let us not aggravate the situation.

Here are our Sikh brothers. Some of them, not all, a few went to the extent of thinking in terms of Khalistan. We could not agree to such a thing. They have some problems. We can settle them. In the same way, in the same spirit, what the Accord has done is this: They have opened a new chapter in the sense that there should be accommodation between the two minority and majority ethnic groups. There is this accommodation. Therefore, we are sending our Army. Otherwise, why should we send our Army? Is there need at all? And it is a very great risk we have taken upon ourselves, because we are compelled to do so. Now if you go on asking how long you are going to remain there, for five years or 10 years or 20 years, there cannot be any limit. Basically we should prepare our mind to settle the differences. I want to ask one question: Was it possible for the guerillas or the Tigers to establish

peace on their own terms? Was it ever possible? Neither was it possible for Mr. Jayewardene to suppress them completely. I can understand, Guerilla warfare is such a thing in which the regular army cannot defeat the well-equipped guerillas. And these Tigers are getting help from other sources. India is so near. The Government of India cannot stop even if they try. From the southern districts of Tamil Nadu help is bound to reach them. So, for Jayewardene it was a problem. How long can he go on fighting? The economy of Sri Lanka was shattering. Inflation was rising. Therefore, they were also under compulsion.

Now we have got a chance to have the unification of the Northern and Eastern Provinces. There is the provision for referendum. That is the maximum we can help; the two provinces can be united into one province. (Time bell) Suppose if they fail in referendum, what can we do from here in Delhi and from Parliament? It is for the Sri Lankan Tamils to win over the Muslim Tamils, the Moors, the Sinhalese. And if they win them over, I think, almost 90 per cent of the problem gets settled. About the Mosad and other things, it is already there in the Accord. That whole thing is to be dismantled. There are other aspects of the Accord which are also favourable. But the most important thing, as my elderly friend, Mr. Kulkarni, has said is this Keep in mind the international background also. India should not look as if quarrelling with all its neighbours. At least you have shown here that we can come to a settlement. Sir, we have arrived at a settlement although our friends have not liked. I can understand the misgivings of our Tamil friends, which are genuine. You have made big sacrifices and that is also there. But in the interests of the country and in the interests of longterm peace....

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): Mr. Mehta, please conclude now.

SHRI CHIMANBHAI MEHTA:.. try to see that you also join the mainstream of Sri Lanka and bring about a historical, longterm, lasting solution and India and Sri Lanka remain as friends as they were before. Thank your very much.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): Hon. Members, as the Hon. Minister has to go to attend a meeting, I would request the Members to be brief and precise.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH): Sir, it is not that I do not attach importance to the meeting here. But the thing is that I have to attend a meeting of the Consultative Committee on Foreign Affairs to discuss Sri Lanka at 6.30 p.m.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY (Karnataka): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I do not speak for a long time.

SHRI CHITTA BASU (West Bengal): Sir, since a meeting of the Consultative Committee has been called on this very subject and we are also Members there and we are very much willing to speak in this forum, how can the Minister attend both the meetings? How will it be possible? So, I think that meeting should be postponed.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, Sri Lanka and the problem of Tamil minorities has been discussed several times in this House. Now we are discussing this problem in a new context. For the last four years there were three parties which participated in the negotiations, the Government of Sri Lanka, the Government of India and the Tamils in Sri Lanka. These were the three parties all these four years which were talking with each other to reach an understanding, but somehow suddenly these tripartite negotiations became bilateral, trilateral became bilateral. The accord was signed not between all these three parties. The accord was signed between two parties, the Government of Sri Lanka on the one side and the Government of India on the other. Tamils are nowhere in the picture. They are not the signatories to this accord.

Maybe, for various reasons and compulsions they have accepted the accord, but they are not the signatories. Secondly, the Government of India played the role of a mediator all along.

The Vice Chairman (Shri Jagesh Desai) in the Chair.

But now, Government has become a party, not a mediator. It changed its position dramatically. So, the destiny of ethnic minorities in Sri Lanka was decided by two parties, the Government of India and the Government of Sri Lanka, with the hesitant acceptance by various Tamil groops. I feel this is one of the weakness of the accord.

Secondly, how can the Government of India take responsibility on itself to implement the accord? It has taken that responsibility, and the Government of Sri Lanka has conceded that the Government of India should take the burden of seeing through the settlement. I do not want to go into other technical questions here, whether it was technically right on the part of the Government of India to station its troops in Sri Lanka. The only thing that disturbs me in my mind is, if the accord is not implemented, if there is trouble again, if Tamilians are not satisfied, if they agitate or revolt, whether the Government of India will use its troops to subdue their protest, to kill their reaction. This is one of the worries in my mind.

The other worry is about the referendum which is part and parcel of the accord. To my mind, this is the Achillies' heel of the accord. Referendum has got to be fair, and if it has to be fair, then all those Tamils who have gone out of the Northern and Eastern provinces, should come back and settle there and those Sinhalese who have settled there, should be taken out. In other words, conditions for referendum should be created and it should be acceptable to the Tamil minorities there. So, I would like to ask my friend whether it is going to happen, whether referendum can take place, or will take place at all within the scheduled time. Assuming that if the referendum is held, what will happen to the political system there which has been envisaged in the accord? According to the accord, Mr. Vice-Chairman, both these provinces should become united; there should be a Council; there should be a Ministry; there should be a Governor. If the referendum goes against the unity, for some reason or the other, if the Eastern province does not want to stay with Northern province if it separates itself from the northern province, what will happen to the political set-up? What will happen to the Members who will be elected to the Council? What will happen to the Ministry? What will happen to the Governor? I woud like to ask. If there is separation of the two provinces *after the referendum, we will come back* to the same position from where we began. If perchance, there is a vote against the merger of the two provinces, the purpose, the main objective, of the accord will be undone. It may lead to a lot of complications. This is another lacuna in the accord.

Thirdly, no steps have been taken by the Sri Lankan Government so far -- the time is short, no doubt -- to create conditions immediately to enable the three lakh people, Tamil people, who have left Sri Lanka to come back and settle there. This is another important thing which has to be borne in mind.

Finally, I say, the accord is good or bad only in its implementation. I do not want to go into the whole thing for want of time. The accord is bad if it is not implemented. The accord is good if it is implemented. Sir, the success of the accord depends upon how it is going to be implemented. With these words, I say that we have to watch and we cannot pass any judgement on this accord now. The Prime Minister may say that this accord is historic. It may be so. But we have to watch and reserve our judgement. Thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): There are five or six speakers more and then the hon. Minister will reply. We have to complete this debate by 6.30 p.m. I will request hon. Members to be as brief as possible.

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am very happy that the strife and bloodshed has ended as a result of this agreement between India and Sri Lanka. This agreement was signed on 29th July between the President of Sri Lanka and the Indian Prime Minister. Sir, the conflict between the ethnic Tamil minority and the Sinhalese majority goes back to June 5, 1956 when the then Prime Minister, Shri S. W. R. D. Bandaranaike introduced in Parliament the language Bill, "the Only Sinhala Bill." Then, the Sri Lankan Tamil protested against this discrimination and they offered Satyagraha. During these three decades, nearly 16,000 people lost their lives. In the last four years, many hundreds of people lost their lives and a lot of property has been destroyed. But we are happy that as a result of this agreement signed on 29th July, this has all ended. At the same time, we have some doubts. We have to see whether this Agreement, in spite of the good intention behind it, will be successful. The question is whether it will be implemented in letter and spirit. The thing that creates doubt in our mind is that India has all along pleaded that she is not a party to the conflict and that it is only playing a mediatory role, that the conflict was between the Sri Lankan Government and its own Tamil speaking ethnic people. But now we have become a party to the agreement and the very party -- the Ethnic section of Tamils of Sri Lankan people -- who were fighting with the Sri Lankan Government against injustice is not a party to the agreement. That is the main problem. How are you going to implement this agreement, both in letter and spirit, without the consent of the militant section of people who were fighting for justice and rights all these days and who had suffered a lot in this fighting? That is the most important thing. I would like to know from the Minister as to how Government of India is going to implement this agreement without the consent of that section of the pepole who were fighting all these days, so that it is successful. That is one of the most important points that is agitating the minds of the people.

Secondly, Government of India has taken a heavy burden on its shoulders by this agreement. It is not that the success of the agreement depends upon the people of Sri Lanka alone it depends also on the cooperation of the Tamil people of Sri Lanka including Sinhalese and the Sri Lankan Government. It is to be seen how Government of India which has become a party to this agreement fulfils the responsibility that lies on it. Of course, Sri Lankan Government is also a party to it. But we cannot only depend on it. There is distrust between the Sri Lankan people and Sri Lankan Government. So a great burden lies on the Government of India to see that this agreement is fully implemented.

Thirdly, it seems a large section of the Sinhala people are against this agreement and there are some reservations so far as militant groups are concerned -- like the LTTE and others, who are not a party to the agreement. They have said in so many words that there was no other choice but to accept the agreement for the time being. But a section of Sinhala people have openly demonstrated and acted against the agreement. More especially the Prime Minister and members of the Cabinet have spoken openly against the agreement. I do not know whether they have changed their minds and whether Government of India have got any confirmed information from Sri Lanka whether the Prime Minister of that country has changed his views? I would like to know this from the hon. Minister.

Then, as I have said, the Indian Government and the Indian army have to carry on a great burden on their shoulders. As a matter of fact, Mr. Jayewardene has sought military help not only from India but also military help from the United States of America, Pakistan, Israel and China. I do not know why? When he has accepted Indian help, then why he has appealed for military help from these countries. I would like the hon. Minister to enlighten us on this subject because this is what is causing a

lot of agitation in the minds of people and create further trouble.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Biggest hypocrite.

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY: Mr. Jayawardene says the conflict has been avoided, but this could have been done long ago. Mr. Jayawardene said at the time of the signing of this agreement that in the past he was unwise, unintelligent and unimaginative.

Now he has become courageous, intelligent and wise. I hope he will not turn unintelligent, unwise and uncourageous again. He must implement the agreement. The agreement wants -- that the Tamil people of Sri Lanka should live in honour, dignity and freedom for which they were fighting all these days. I think we will have to carry Jayawardene on our shoulders to implement this agreement.

There is another point on which I want to express my views. Suppose Jayawardene falls -- if he is defeated and he has no power -- then what will happen to this agreement -- because a section of the Sinhalese are not in favour of this agreement? Then we have to wait how the Government of India will play its role to see that it is implemented?

This agreement is most ambigous not clear, on many problems. So I would like to have from the honourable Minister a clarification on devoluting powers.

Sir, many of the militant Tamil groups especially LTTE and others--have many reservations. They are not very happy about this agreement. For the time being they have accepted it but we do not know how they are going to act in future. So I would like to know because you had conducted the negotiations and talks with these groups -- whether the Government of India has any clear understanding that these groups accept this agreement into to and they will not have asy reservations. This is also important.

Then, Sir, the most important is sub-clause (2) of clause 6 which is about a referendum. This is a most dangerous clause in the agreement. When you have come to the conclusion that the Sri Lankan Tamils should live in honour, dignity and freedom by having single province by merging North and East then why again are you creating this uncertainty by having this clause of referendum in the East? This will again create trouble and there will not be any peace in that part of the country. So, even now it is better to see that the referendum clause be deleted. Also, the Tamil provinces of both the north and the east should become one single unit without any further referendum and the Tamils there must have full freedom to manage their own affairs.

Now, the agreement has to be ratified by the Sri Lankan Parliament. It is not yet done. It was to be done by the 18th of this month but I think now they are saying it will be done in September or October. I do not know how much time they will take and whether it will be ratified. This is also a most important thing which is agitating the minds of the people both in Sri Lanka and in India.

Then, I have to pay my homage to the three brave Indian soldiers who have laid down their lives in the course of performing their duties in Sri Lanka. I also send my condolences to the members of bereaved families. The Indian Army there has to fight on two fronts. One is against the Tamil people themselves if they do not lay down their arms. There are reports that still many of the militant groups have not laid down their arms because they have got their reservations and, in that case, the Indian Army has to fight against those Tamils. I want to know whether the Government of India is ready to do that.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Then it will be the worst disaster.

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY: Yes, then it will be a disaster. The other front is, when these arms are surrendered to the Indian Army. Then it has to fight

[Shri B. Satyanarayan Reddy]

against the Sinhalese majority to establish peace in the other parts of Sri Lanka. Both ways the Indian Army has to face this difficulty. I would like to know from the Minister how he is going to solve this problem.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Now all your points are over.

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY: I have to say what happens, Sir. Lastly Sir, by this agreement, a great injustice has been done to stateless Tamils in Sri Lanka who have been living there for hundreds of years and who do not want to leave Sri Lanka. But by this agreement, about, two lakhs of stateless Tamil Indians have to be repatriated to India and in exchange 1,50,000 Tamilian refugees have to be sent back to Sri Lanka. I would like to say that this is most injustice. They are living in Sri Lanka for hundreds of years. So, this should not have been done. All Tamil refugees in India should be allowed to go to Sri Lanka to live in peace and dignity. Lastly, I would say,....

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Your last point never comes.

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY: It is over. About more than 5,000 Tamil people are in jails, and only a few of them have been released. Many of them are still languishing in the jails. I would like to know whether all will be released immediately, because reports say that many families are waiting, their family members are waiting to receive them, but they do not find them. And one Reverend Bishop has stated in a public statement that 600 of the prisoners who had been arrested, have disappeared. I do not know where they have gone. But he says that they might have been liquidated. So, the Government of India must see to it and see that every person who has been arrested and who are in jail are released and is safely sent to their homes.

Also, the 200 military camps that have been established in the eastern and northern parts of Sri Lanka should be closed, and the Sri Lankan military should be sent to the barracks.

Lastly I would say that this agreement should be implemented fully so that there will be permanent peace in Sri Lanka and there must be permanent friendship between India and Sri Lanka.

Thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Mr. Jaswant Singh. You are known for your pointed questions. So, I would request you to speak in your old style so that the least time is consumed.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Rajasthan): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, mindful of the effects that the tedium of this debate has already had on the hon. Minister of State, I shall be very brief.

Sir, first, at the very outset, I think, it is very necessary to state that some of the terms being used, are not in their proper context. This is called the "Sri Lanka agreement". As far as the Government of India is concerned, I have such a superstitious dread about the use of the word "accord" that I am glad that the Government has chosen to adopt this new word "agreement."

And who can possibly oppose political resolutions of complex and violent ethnic, social and historical conflicts? I don't think the essence of today's discussion is about opposing such a political resolution or supporting such a political resolution. Unquestionably, however, there is significant of some aspects of this agreement, we would be blind if we do not take note of those points. The first is, at the time of the signing of this agreement, a large part of Sri Lanka was under curfew. Colombo was closed. It is extremely regrettable that the person of our Prime Minister was assaulted by a Sri Lankan naval rating, in a guard of honour. It is also now a fact that there is delay, recognised delay in the surrender

of arms. There is significance in all these things, and we would be blind not to take note of these things.

The second, whose irony, I am sure, is not lost one the hon. Minister of State, is the fact that at the time of the signing of this agreemen , the Sri Lankan Premier and indeed some other members of the Sri Lankan Cabinet deliberately abstained themselves from which we come to the second factor of significance, and it is a legitimate query which a number of other speakers have refrerred to: Between whom is this agreement. Is it between President Jayawardene and Prime Minister Gandhi? Or is it between them as Heads of their Governments or as individuals? I is right, as has been pointed out by a number of speakers, this conflict is ethnic, it is social and it has a historical origins. Therefore, does this agreement o accord tend to appear as an arrangemen between two individuals or is it a serious and lasting commitment of two Governments? Is it a settlement of contending issues or does it only convey a temporary impression of a palliative?

Sir, I am led to a conclusion and the conclusion is that given the circumstances in which this agreement has been arrived at, the best I can do is call to it; from a basketful of bad options, possibly this was the least bad option. Then, it takes me to other conclusions which are that if a Government, any Government, particularly our Government, is reduced to a situation wherein it can only pluck out an option which we call the least bad from lot of other bad options; then that, I think by itself is a comment certainly on our Sri Lanka policy and on the conduct of our diplomacy as far as the past three or four years are concerned.

Sir, I do not wish now, in the current euphoria, to make a reference to the fiasco about the episode of relief ships or of the air-dropping of food packets. I am nevertheless struck by the hon. Prime Minister asserting that this is 'the agreement of the century, in the whole world. which he subsequently rectified to say, if not the whole world, possibly this country. Now, this is a remark redolent of his characteristic modesty. The best I can do or hope is that the Prime Minister is even partially right. Even if it is not the agreement of the century, I do hope for the sake of India, for the sake of Indo-Sri Lankan relations that he is partially right.

Sir, I would like to caution this Government what we have ahead of us a very long haul, of brickbats and bad news, not bouqets. Therefore, in all sincerely, I would like to advise this Government, do not raise public expectations about this accord. Tamper your public pronouncement with realism. It is a very long haul. It will challenge the nation. It Will call for the best from this Government as indeed from the Opposition. It will call and hope for the best from our Armed Forces. It is an unwise posture that the Government of India is presently adopting as if the signing of the agreement itself is a great achievement. It is no doubt a step forward. But it is a small step forward and in the very taking of that step you have created, generated in its consequence a host of other problems which will challenge this Government and possibly even successive Governments.

Sir, I would come to the specific questions and then I will conclude. As I started by saying, the sheer wear and tear of the tedium of this debate is telling on the hon. Minister of State. I am given to understand that some time later he has to go and discuss Sri Lanka again in a committee meeting. I do not, therefore, wish to prolong his agony. There are certain intriguing aspects of this agreement.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: Not only my agony but yours too.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Mine too, because my agony is on two accounts. My agony on the second account is that I know that whatever clarifications I seek for, I shall not receive satisfactory replies to. Therefore, from the very beginning, in the very process of making this intervention, I have to start with the fore knowledge of that impending frustration. Now, I recognise that the Minister of State for

[Shri Jaswant Singh]

External Affairs is inhibited. He will, perhaps, not be able to give me all the carifications that I ask for. I understand why he won't be able to do so. He won't be able to do so because this is one of the fundamental weaknesses of this Agreement. If he were to clarify the points that I am going to ask, in the wake of these clarificatiins, further controversies and complications would arise. Such is the fragile and tenuous nature of this agreement. If it was an agreement of issues, then we would not be faced with such a fragility. However, let me come to the intriguing aspects on which I would request the Minister to shed light. Firstly, about the role of the Indian military. A number of speakers have alluded to this, there are however, two or three specific aspects of the role of the Indian military which I do feel, not perhaps with the agreement, but certainly to us in India and certainly to the armed forces themselves, which are vital. One of the worst things that the armed forces can be entrusted with the areas in which their roles, their tasks, their responsibilities are left grey and undefined. The military mind finds it extremely difficult to operate professionally and efficiency where their task is not a clear, categorical assigned task. Task (a) responsibility. If the task is (a) to (z) and that is the responsibility of the Indian military, then the Indian military shall rounder, and it is a matter on which the Government should reflect very deeply what precisely is it that we expect the Indian armed forces to do in their peace keeping role, how will they keep that 'peace', given the complexity of the situation, which I do not have to elaborate upon, which some of the earlier speakers have already referred to? There is the knowledge that we already have of the perils of peace keeping roles and I am merely referring to West Asia or earlier historical examples. Are we entering into some such new arena? Are we prepared for it mentally? Have we taken into account the various contingencies? There is, then, Sir, in this role of the military the aspect of the totality of India's security concerns and some hon. speakers have referred to this aspect also earlier. We are given to understand that some letters have been exchanged with reference particularly to the fact and future of Trincomalee, of the setting up of a Voice of America Station, of the setting up of an Oil Storage Yard, of the presence of certain external forces in Sri Lanka, their withdrawal and of the recognition of India's legitimate, rightful, indeed due primacy as far as our security aspects are involved. The question specifically here is that—and he is a very eminent diplomat with the life-time of experience in that field—he should ask this question himself, not necessary, that he replies me, what is the status of letters exchanged which do not constitute a part of an agreement even as appendices? Those letters do not form part of the agreement. What is the status, what will be the status tomorrow, the next year etc. And this is matter which we ought to reflect on deeply, not raise exaggerated expectations and hopes about. Secondly, as there were certain hidden aspects of the autonomy the loose ends of autonomy, the eastern province etc. and because the other speakers have already mentioned these factors, I shall not refer to them. There is also a certain amount of ambiguity in the devolution of powers. In fact, there is a step back from the December 19 proposals and in that sense, it is not as satisfactory as it is being made out to be. However, if the Sri Lankan Tamils find it satisfactory, if the Government of India finds it satisfactory, there is nothing sacrosanct about December 19. It is not as if December 19 is a deity which we must, in perpetuity, worship. Though, in regard to the authorship of the December 19 proposals, the hon. Minister of State had his own contributions to make, the December 19 proposals have been jettisoned, thrown away. I am not worried about it. But I think there needs to be a certain amoun of clarification ned on this aspect.

There is this aspect of equating refugees with repatriates and other speakers have mentioned about Sirimavo Shastri Accord and the 150,000 Sri Lankan Tamil refugees against 200,000 Indias. This is reopening of the chapter. However, the Government of India have reopened the chapter for some logic good. Please explain to us what that logic good is. The powers of

the provincial government have not been defined. The role of police has not been defined. The fears of the LTTE is the next point needing elaboration. They have been very graphically outlined by my previous speaker Mr. Gopalsamy. I do not repeat all that. But I think, Mr. Prabhakaran has been saying in public about the fears of the LTTE and the hon. Minister must comment on them.

Finally, Sir, on the question of Sri Lankan Parliament's role. We all know that the Sri Lankan Parliament has not ratified it. The Sri Lankan President has gone on record saying that if the Parliament does not accept, if his Parliament does not accpet—Thank God, our Prime Minister does not say that if it is not approved unanimously, I will dissolve the Parliament—he will dissolve it. The Sri Lankan President has certainly stated that if the Parliament does not agree with him, he will dissolve that Parliament. Now, if the Sri Lankan Parliament does not ratify it, legally it might not make any difference to the agreement. But it would make a very substantial difference to the tone, the atmosphere and the ambience in which the agreement has to be implemented.

There are two concluding thoughts. I am sure the hon. Minister is aware of them. I am sure he will not shed any light on these. Our role in the past four or five years and in this agreement has implications which are no flattering to India and we would be making a mistake if we do not take note of the consequences of these implications. Some earlier speakers referred to the courage of the Prime Minister in arriving at this agreement. It is a subjective judgment and equally subjectively some others might say differently.

What one calls courage, the other might call foolhardiness. It is often found in military equations also. One man's courage is another man's foolhardiness. Only time will tell whether it was courage or it was foolhardiness.

Finally, Sir, it is a fall out, internal fall out of the recommending or accepting of a referendum in the Eastern Province and there is an internal fall out out which will affect our internal politics. The Government of India would do well to reflect on that aspect also. As I started by saying, of course, who can possibly disagree with that which is a political settlement of a deep-seated ethnic strife? But is it a settlement? Is it really an agreement?

6.00 P.M.

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह (बिहार) : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, जब हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ने श्रीलंका समझौता कर के भारत की भूमि पर पदार्पण किया तो यहां ऐसा वातावरण बनाया गया जैसे बहुत बड़ा युद्ध जीतकर आए हों या कोई बड़ी विजय हासिल कर के आए हों । ऐसा लगता था कि उन्होंने कोई विजय हासिल की है ।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Since the Business Advisory Committee has said that the House can sit beyond 6 o'clock, I seek your permission.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: I think there are still more Members to speak but I have to go to the Consultative Committee meeting in the Annexe and it will be in a way impolite if I am not there before the Members get there...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Mr Matto is not here. Mr. Chitta Basu is the last speaker.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: The Minister can give the reply tomorrow.

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : महोदय, यह कहा गया कि यह ऐतिहासिक समझौता हुआ है । इसमें कोई शक नहीं है कि अपनी तरफ से, अपने ढंग का यह समझौता ऐतिहासिक है । ऐतिहासिक इस माने में जरुर है कि जिन पार्टियों के बीच समझौता होना है, जिनको शर्तों को मानना है वे तो अलग हैं, उनमें से एक पार्टी है भारत सरकार जिसको समझौते को नहीं मानना है, वह पार्टी जा करके हस्ताक्षर करती है । मतलब यह है कि

[श्री राम अवधेश सिंह]

दूसरी पार्टी की ओर से जबरिए उसका झगड़ा अपने ऊपर लेना है । ऐकार्ड सफल होता है तब तो कोई बात नहीं है, लेकिन अगर श्रीलंका सरकार इसे नहीं मानती है और वहां के तमिल निवासी इसे नहीं मानते हैं तो दोनों हालतों में भारत सरकार को उससे उलझना पड़ेगा और झगड़ना पड़ेगा और नाहक भारत सरकार ने यह खेल खेला है । मेरी समझ में, जैसी सूचनाएं आ रही हैं उनसे लगता है कि भारत सरकार फंस गई है । मुझे लगता है कि यह जल्दी में समझौता क्यों हुआ, मैं आपको बताता हूं । मई महीने के भारत आखीर में जब यह संसद बंद हो रही थी तो सरकार के एक अफसर ने मुझसे कहा कि आप लोगों ने बोफोर्स कांड पर भारत सरकार के खिलाफ जो झमेला खड़ा किया है या जो फेयर फैक्स से सबमैरीन्स की हवा तैयार हुई है भारत सरकार के खिलाफ, उसकी काट तैयार की जा रही है । भारत सरकार को मालूम है, श्री राजीव गांधी को मालूम है कि उत्तर भारत में अब हम टिकने वाले नहीं हैं, उत्तर भारत से हम जाने वाले हैं, तो दक्षिण भारत से ऐसी चीज तैयार की जाए कि तमिलनाडु और दक्षिण भारत के लोग हमारे साथ हो जाएं और इसी जल्दीबाजी में समझौता करना था कि तमिल लोगों को खुश किया जा सके । यहां प्रभाकरन साहब को बुलाकर भारत सरकार ने अपनी कस्टडी में रखा । उनसे बातचीत में कोई राय नहीं ली और राय भी ली तो उन्होंने कह दिया कि हम नहीं मानते । उन दिनों के अखबारों को तो आप सब ने पढ़ा होगा, देखा होगा कि प्रभाकरन साहब ने उसका विरोध किया था, जबरदस्त विरोध किया था । इस जबरदस्त विरोध के बावजूद जब यहां पर बोफोर्स कांड की हवा संसद में गरम थी और दोनों सदनों में बहस हो रही थी बोफोर्स कांड पर तो उस समय भारत के प्रधान मंत्री की भारत की संसद के प्रति जवाबदेही नहीं थी, जवाबदेही की जिम्मेदारी नहीं थी, उनको याद नहीं था कि हमको यहां जवाब देना है ? भारत की जनता के मन में जो गुस्सा और संदेह था उसका जवाब देते ।

उस समय वह संसद को जवाब देने के बजाय दौड़ कर लंका गये और लंका में उन्होंने जो समझौता किया वह हमारे गले में एक अजीबोगरीब हड्डी अटक गयी । फर्ज कीजिए जैसा हमारे साथी गोपाल-सामीजी ने कहा 30 जुलाई को ही जयवर्धने साहब ने कहा कि हम अमेरिका, चाइना' इजराइल की सहायता मांगेंगे । मान लीजिए तमिल लोगों ने अपने हथियार सुपुर्द कर दिये । जब हथियार उन्होंने सुपुद कर दये तो क्या नतीजा होगा । जो काम जयवर्धने के लिए, उनकी मिलिटरी के लिए असंभव था, जाफना से, नार्थ और पूर्वी इलाके से मिलिटरी के लिए कम से कम घुस कर उनके हाथों से, उनके घरों से हथियार निकालना असंभव था उस काम को जयवर्धने ने बड़ी चालाकी से भारतीय सेना के जरिये करा लिया । उसमें सफलता प्राप्त की । क्या एग्रीमेंट में ऐसा है कि जयवर्धने कहेंगे कि आप अपनी सेना ले जाओ इसके बावजूद भी क्या हम रखेंगे ? फर्ज कीजिए जैसी आज आवाज आ रही हैं तमिल लोग कहते हैं और संसद सदस्यों की भी मांग है कि कम से कम 10 साल तक सेना रखी जाये जबकि जयवर्धने कहते हैं कि नहीं, आपने हथियार डाल दिये अब आप वापस चले जाइये तो क्या भारत की सेना वहां रह सकेगी ? क्या आप एग्रीमेंट के मुताबिक रख सकते हैं ? उस हालत में अगर आप कहते हैं कि नहीं मैं रखूंगा तब भी एग्रीमेंट का वायलेशन है क्योंकि एग्रीमेंट में स्पष्ट लिखा हुआ है जिस क्षण श्रीलंका प्रेजीडेंट जयवर्धने कहेंगे कि आप सेना वापस ले जाओ उसी समय आपको सेना वापस ले जानी पड़ेगी । जब सेना वापस ले जायेंगे तो फिर वह अमेरिकी फौज बुलाते हैं या और किसी को सहायता के लिए बुलाते हैं और हथियार से रहित तमिलों पर कहर

ढाते हैं । मैं आपके माध्यम से कहना चाहता हूं कि उन कारणों की खोज इस एग्रीमेंट में नहीं की गयी है जिन कारणों से वहां बगावत हुई । आखिर बगावत क्यों हुई ? (**समय की घंटी**) मेरे साथ हर बार अन्याय होता है ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री जगेश देसाई) : मैंने चार मिनट कहा था आपके 8 मिनट हो गये ।

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : पार्टी के हिसाब से चार मिनट नहीं होते कम से कम 8 या 10 मिनट होते हैं । थे तीन-चार मिनट में कैसे बैठ सकता हूं ।

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Sir, the Minister also should not be placed in a position to make his speech in a hurry because we want to hear him at length. He said that he wants at least half an hour. My submission, therefore, is that the honourable Minister may speak tomorrow.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Yes, the Minister is replying only tomorrow because there is no time now.

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : दो-तीन मिनट और लूंगा । मैं उन कारणों की ओर आपका ध्यान खींचना चाहता हूं जिन कारणों से वहां बगावत हुई । ब्रिटिश हुकूमत के जाने के बाद जब वहां जनतंत्र बहाल हुआ तो वहां के तमिल लोगों के मन में भी इच्छा पैदा हुई कि हम भी बराबरी के तौर पर वहां रहें । हमारे लोगों को राजपाट में हिस्सा मिले । हमारे लोगों को सरकारी मशीनरी में हिस्सा मिले । इंजीनियरिंग कालेज में एडमिशन हो, मेडिकल कालेज में एडमिशन हो और इन्जीनियरिंग कालेज में एडमिशन हो मेडिकल कालेज में एडमिशन हो और इंजीनियरिंग कालेज में एडमिशन हो, मेडिकल कालेज में एडमिशन हो और पुलिस में और पलटन में हो और सरकार में उनको हिस्सा मिले । लेकिन उनको जान-बूझकर हिस्सेदारी नहीं दी जा रही हैं । इसका नतीजा यह हुआ कि वहां बगावत हुई और वे लोग आज अटोनोमी की मांग कर रहे हैं । श्रीलंका सरकार से उसको हिस्सेदारी नहीं मिल रही हैं । आज यही स्थिति हमारे यहां भी हैं । इस मुल्क में भी वही चल रहा है । यहां मुट्ठी भर लोग शासन में बैठे हुए हैं । हमारे देश में जो हरिजन, पिछड़े वर्ग के लोग आदिवासी और माइनोरिटीज हैं, जो इस देश में 87 परसेंट से भी ज्यादा हैं, उनको हिस्सेदारी नहीं मिल रही है । यहां भी आज या कल यह बगावत होगी यह सरकार हथियारों की बात सुनती है । सरकार लात से ही बात सुनती है, बात से यह सरकार सुनने वाली नहीं है ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री जगेशदेसाई) : आपके 12 मिनट हो गये हैं । अब आप समाप्त कीजिये ।

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : मैं एक वाक्य में समाप्त कर रहा हूं मैं निश्चित तौर पर कह सकता कि यह जो समझौता है यह विफल होगा और भारत सरकार को और राजीव गांधी जी को बहुत ही गहरा मूल्य चुकाना पड़ेगा क्योंकि जिस जल्दी में यह समझौता हुआ है और यह सोच कर हुआ है कि तमिलनाडु की जनता अगले चुनावों में हमारा साथ देगी, वह चुनावों में साथ नहीं देगी और जिस प्रकार से हरियाणा में हुआ है उसी प्रकार से दक्षिण भारत भी आपको जवाब देगा, सारे उत्तर भारत में भी वही हालत होगी ।

SHRI CHITTA BASU (West Bengal): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, this treaty has both positive and negative aspects. For me, it is not a matter of hilarous euphoria, nor a matter of outright condemnation and rejection. A balanced approach is needed and with your kind permission, I shall set out some of the points.

[Shri Chitta Basu]

The Agreement meets some of the important aspirations which have animated the Tamil minorities in Sri Lanka for the prolonged and long drawn-out struggle. This is from the statement of the hon. Minister. These aspects are (1) the desire to be recognised as a distinct ethnic entity; (2) political autonomy or managing their political future; (3) an appropriate devolution of governmental power to meet the objective; (4) the recognition of the Northern and Eastern Provinces of Sri Lanka as areas of historic habitation of the Tamils and (5) acknowledgement of the designation of Tamil as an official language of Sri Lanka.

These are some of the basic aspiration which animated the Sri Lanka Tamils in their long drawn-out struggle. I believe that there should be a total approach to the Agreement as well as the letters exchanged between the two Governments. An analysis of the different clauses and subclauses of the Agreement as well as the letters exchanged between the two Governments brings forth two propositions. One is that India agrees to lend its military support including the presence of its troops in helping Sri Lanka restore ethnic peace. Now, I want a clarification from the Minister at this stage. As a corollary, it may be presumed that India is also bound to help Sri Lanka in the matter of meeting the challenge now being thrown by the JVP movement. The second proposition is that in return, Sri Lanka has agreed to meet or accommodate some of India's regional security concern. As it has already been mentioned. I do not like to elaborate it. They got Trincomalee. The Government of Sri Lanka has agreed that Trincomalee or any other parts of Sri Lanka will not be made available for military use by any country in a manner prejudicial to India's interest. Again, in return, Sri Lanka has agreed that the Sri Lanka's agreement with foreign broadcasting organisations will be reviewed. So far so good. Therefore, it has got both positive aspects and negative aspects. But again what commitment our Government had to make? That has also to be taken into account. India on its part has agreed that it will deport all Sri Lankan citizens indulging in terrorist activities or advocating separation or secession. I do not know what is the burden behind it. India would provide training facilities and military supplies for Sri Lankan security forces, etc. etc. From these, it is quite apparent that India—I am sorry to make this comment—would not mind aligning with a regime of a neighbouring country if that neighbouring country is prepared to meet India's regional security concern. This, according to me, is the new Indian Monroe doctrine.

Regarding its negative aspects, Sir, I would only mention one or two. There has been a promise that the northern and eastern provinces will be united into a single administrative unit. And according to them, this will give the Tamils a sense of homeland. Sir, it is tenable, it is not correct. It is fragile because it depends upon the referendum which the Tamils cannot win. It is not necessary for me to explain because other friends have already explained it. And Mr. Jayewardene did not make it any secret. As a result of what he has said, it may be a trap for the Sri Lankan Tamils. The only tangible gain out of the agreement which may go to the Tamils is that their Tamil language has been recognised as an official language. But that does not prevent the majority Sinhalese chauvinist, a revengeful Government to continue discrimination which is being perpetrated against them which has also been explained by my predecessors. Therefore, there has not been any major gain for the Tamils in Sri Lanka. And this agreement also does not provide any guarantee to the Sri Lankan Tamils against discrimination and disabilities which they are suffering from.

Lastly, Sir, there have been many disturbing phenomena. One is that the Prime Minister of Sri Lanka and the Security Minister, right from the beginning, have objected to the agreement. And it is quite well-known that the Prime Minister of Sri Lanka and the Security Minister have got, what I may say, prowest affiliations. It is also known that there is a threat to the stability of the Jayewardene Government today. It is also known that the SLAP, the major opposition party in Sri Lanka, has not accepted the agreement and they are

likely to rouse the feelings of the Sinhalese. It is also known that the Buddhist bigotry is also being sought to be roused. All these are negative features. Therefore, I do not call this an event for euphoria, nor do I call it an event of condemination and rejection. Whether the positive aspects will predominate over the negative aspects, the time has not come to give the judgement, nor am I in a position to give the judgement. But I do feel it is a step towards the solution of a political problem in a political way keeping in mind that stand of the people of India and of the Government of India has always been to see that a solution to the ethnic problem of Sri Lanka emerges within the united federal Sri Lanka. Therefore, it is a step in that direction because it does not disrupt the unity of Sri Lanka. It also brings forth certain hopes for federealism for Sri Lanka which may ultimately bring in harmony between different ethnic groups in Sri Lanka which will be good for the people of Sri Lanka as well as India because that clears the condition for the improvement of security environment to which we have been reduced.

SHRI GHULAM RASOOL MATTO (Jammu and Kashmir): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am very grateful to you for accommodating me at this last stage.

In International Agreements, as we all know, there is always a spirit of give and take. I have heard with rapt attention the speeches that were made in this House and it was given out that there were some positive aspects of the agreement and there were certain negative aspects of the agreement. But in international agreements like this, we have to draw a Balance-Sheet and when you draw a Balance-Sheet, you have to find out whether the positive aspects outweigh the negative aspects or *vice-versa* I find in this Agreement that positive aspects far outweigh the negative aspects. It is a good agreement and I see this Agreement from an entirely different angle. There is no doubt that everybody in India from Kashmir to Kanya Kumari has had and continues to have good and brotherly feelings for our Tamilian brethren. Everyone without party affiliations has been supporting their legitimate cause. That being so, we have tried to espouse their cause. But I see this agreement in a different perspective and that perspective to my mind is the Security Environment. My personal view is that if this Agreement had not come about during the course of the foreseeable future, I think Sri Lanka would have become another Diego Garcia or things like that would have happened. I congratulate the Hon. Prime Minister and his Government that they have averted that position and we have in our neighbourhood a country which will be very friendly to us for all time to come. That has been ensured by different agreements and the letters exchanged between the Government of India and Government of Sri Lanka To my mind, this is a very great issue and we cannot think of a greater achievement. I feel that this was a question, I do not know whether the Hon. Minister of State would agree with me, but as a layman I feel that it was a question of time and if within the next seven days after we entered into the agreement, I mean that if it had been delayed by another seven days only, things would have been different and Sinhalese extremists would have taken over and Jayewardene would have been in a very precarious position. I may be wrong but that is my personal view. (*Interruptions*) Having said this I will only request the Hon. Minister of State to reassure us that the interests of Tamils, all sections of Tamils, would be safeguarded for all time to come. And if

any impediments are placed by the Sinhalese or by anybody else, or for that matter, by the Government of Sri Lanka, the Government of India will assure us that the interest of Tamils will be safeguarded and they will be protected, under all circumstances.

With these words, I again congratulate the Government for this Agreement.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): The Minister will reply later.

The House adjourns till 11 a.m. on 18th August, 1987.

The House then adjourned at twenty-six minutes past six of the clock till eleven of the clock on Tuesday, the 18th August, 1987.

MGIPMRND—RS I—918 RS—27—11—87